

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
	10/082,243	02/26/2002	Naoya Ichikawa	2809-0124P	3483		
	2292	7590 01/29/2004		EXAMINER			
		BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			MULCAHY, PETER D		
	PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				1713			
			DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					$\mathcal{M}($					
<del>-</del> -		Apı	olication No.	Applicant(s)						
		10	/082,243	ICHIKAWA ET AL						
	Office Action Summary	Exa	min r	Art Unit						
			er D. Mulcahy	1713						
- Period fo	- Th MAILING DATE of this commu r Reply	nication appears	onth covrsh twit	h th correspond nce ad	dress					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status										
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) fi	led on <u>03 Novem</u>	<u>nber 2003</u> .		,					
2a)□	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This actio	n is non-final.							
	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Disposition of Claims										
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	<u> </u>									
Application	on Papers			• •						
10) 🗌 🗆	The specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on is/and Applicant may not request that any objected the drawing sheet(s) including the specific process.	e: a) accepted accion to the drawi	ng(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	=R 1 121(d)					
		-			, ,					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.  Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120										
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> <li>13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.</li> <li>37 CFR 1.78.</li> </ul>										
a) 14) <u></u> A	<ul> <li>a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.</li> <li>Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.</li> </ul>									
Attachment										
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review lation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)			ımmary (PTO-413) Paper No( ormal Patent Application (PTC						

Art Unit 1713

Serial No. 10/082,243

The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-9 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,239,253.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instantly claimed invention is directed to species of the generically claimed surfactants. These surfactants are shown and claimed within this patent and as such, the instantly claimed species are rendered prima facie obvious.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the

Serial No. 10/082,243

Art Unit 1713

time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al., either U.S. 6,239,253 or 5,910,567 or 5,610,212 each taken alone and in the alternative.

The '253 patent shows the instantly claimed protease and combination of surfactants at columns 7 and 8.

The '567 patent shows the treatment of natural rubber latexes with the instantly claimed protease and the combination of surfactants at column 4 lines 5+.

The '212 patent shows compositions wherein the natural rubber latex is treated with the protease and combination surfactants at column 3 lines 1+. In view of this disclosure, applicants' claims are seen to be <u>prima facie</u> obvious.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected,

Serial No. 10/082,243

Art Unit 1713

to make and/or use the invention. The invention as described in claim 1 is seen to be not enabled by the instant specification. The claim language of claim 1 is exclusively descriptive of the properties possessed by the natural rubber latex rather than any process step for forming such latex or compositional ingredients utilized in forming such latex. As such, this claim is seen to be a single means claim which covers every conceivable means for achieving the stated property. This is to say that the patentability of the instant claim is exclusively dependent upon the property and the claim is not commensurate in scope with the enabling disclosure of the specification wherein specific latexes are described in terms of compositional ingredients and the processes for forming such latexes. See In re Hyatt 218 USPQ 195.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that no undue or serious burden is placed upon the patent examiner to examine the claims of both groups. This is not found persuasive because the inventions are seen to be distinct for the reasons as advanced in Paper No. 6. Applicants' opinion regarding the undue burden is not necessarily relevant given the different classifications of the invention as well as the distinctness of the inventions. Furthermore, search and examination of one

Art Unit 1713

invention would not necessarily entail the search and examination of the other invention.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter D. Mulcahy, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1107. The examiner can normally be reached during regular business hours.

The fax telephone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0994.

P. Mulcahy:cdc January 21, 2004

> PETER D. MULCAHY PRIMARY EXAMINER